

**Bromsgrove District Council  
Planning Committee**

**Committee Updates: 11 December 2023**

**23/00577/FUL 43A Barkers Lane, Wythall**

Following the publication of the committee report, the applicant's agent has submitted a detailed rebuttal. The rebuttal was added to public access on the day of receipt.

The applicant makes the following comments in relation to the benefits/planning balance of the scheme.

There are clear and compelling benefits which weigh in favour of granting permission. Furthermore, the planning balance is already 'tilted' in favour of approval because the Council has a significant shortfall against its five year housing land requirement. Therefore, the correct approach is that permission should be granted unless "any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits".

The benefits only add further weight in favour of granting planning permission:

- (i) the provision of market housing which should be given very significant weight in the present circumstances where the Council as a very substantial housing land supply deficit (3.3 years) and historic underperformance against the identified requirement (2941 net completions 2011-2022 against the requirement of 4048);
- (ii) the provision of affordable housing which should be given very significant weight given that (by reference to the Council's Housing Land Supply Statement 2021-22) the average delivery as a proportion of the (already low) completions is only 16.71% and zero affordable dwellings were completed in 2020-21 and only eight in 2021-22;
- (iii) the provision of bungalows which meets a specific need (for older persons and those with mobility issues) which in turn frees up larger existing housing stock for families should be given significant weight;
- (iv) the economic benefits (including construction spend and local spend of future residents) should be given moderate weight;
- (v) the effective recycling and re-use of previously developed land should be given moderate weight;
- (vi) per the previous Inspector's finding that sustainable location of development should be given positive weight;
- (vii) an increase in bio-diversity through the removal of an intense hard surfaced layout and provision of green spaces should be given moderate weight; and
- (viii) the removal of an imposing and intense form of development should be given moderate weight. Against that compelling package of benefits the 'negatives' which weigh in the planning balance are at most the limited harm to one purpose of the green belt (if at all), the limited harm (if any) to the openness of the Green Belt, the limited harm (if any) to the landscape and character of the locality and limited harm in terms of the site not being within an identified settlement in policy terms (albeit those relevant policies are out of date and carry diminished weight).

It is clear that the proposed RfRs (reasons for refusal) are ill-founded and fail to take into account the highly material findings of the previous appeal Inspector. It is respectfully submitted that Members should not support those RfR. The benefits of this proposal are compelling and far outweigh any potential harms, accordingly, planning permission should be granted.

**23/00952/FUL 60 East Road, Bromsgrove**

No Updates